

Date: Fri, 7 May 93 04:30:19 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #552
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Fri, 7 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 552

Today's Topics:

Cellular Scanner

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 7 May 93 04:44:32 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!rouge!jab0684@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Cellular Scanner
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <C6MMxz.MM4@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
writes:

>mikey@slic.cts.com (Mike Shirley) writes:

>

>In article <9305041901.AA17674@cmr.ncsl.nist.gov> rc@cmr.ncsl.nist.gov writes:

>

>> Quoted from p.28 of the May 3, 1993, issue of Washington Business, a Monday
>> section of the Washington Post:

>>

>> "..... [House] Subcommittee [on telecommunications and finance] members
>> saw a newly purchased off-the-shelf cellular telephone become a 'scanner'
>> capable of picking up cellular conversations around Capitol Hill.

>> "It took a technician maybe three minutes to reprogram the phone's codes
>> so it could be used for eavesdropping. 'Every cellular phone is a scanner,
>> and they are completely insecure', Sun Micro's Gage said.

>

> If all receivers that can automatically switch between more than 3
> channels and hear the cell band are illegal (or will be next year) to
> produce. What about the phones themselves were they exempted? They can
> switch between all the channels automatically. As far as listening in
> manually like the article describes, it is usually only one channel at a
> time. On the Radio Shack phones you have to type in the CHANNEL # to
> monitor or transmit on.

>

> Dan

>

> --

> *-----*

> * Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa *

> * Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu *

> * Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 *

> * Davis CA 95616 *

> *-----*

> * I do not speak for the University of California.... *

> * and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!! *

> *-----*

>

Hmm, gives me an idea Daniel. Seems to me this anti 800mhz scanner
law also bans...get this...all the POLICE (and other public service) 800
mhz trunking equipment. Certainly all these trunked radios have scanning
receivers and could no doubt be easily reprogramed for the cellular
bands.

Just another comment on our congresscritters' stupidity.

73 DE kb5udf

kb5udf@ucs.usl.edu

Date: Thu, 6 May 1993 20:34:11 EST

From: anomaly.sbs.com!mooch!news@uunet.uu.net

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <easu348.736406456@orion.oac.uci.edu>,

<930503.231753.903.rusnews.w165w@mooch.sbs.com>,

<1993May5.093748.19256@ke4zv.uucp>

Subject : Re: no-code defense

gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

> Well I've been licensed since 1963, Novice then General, that's before

> the Incentive Licensing crap. Now I hold an Advanced. So I know code,
> but I lobbied for, and continue to support, the no code license, as
> did the QCWA, made up *solely* of people licensed before no code, TAPR,
> AMSAT, and other progressive organizations. I believe it's been a huge
> success and has breathed new life into a moribund service. "Incentive"
> licensing nearly killed American amateur radio, and continues to this
> day to impose a nonsensical requirement to demonstrate high speed Morse
> manual skills in order to get access to additional *voice* frequencies
> at HF. That didn't make any sense in 1968, and it still doesn't today.

Well the ARRL did not support no-code for the longest time and I have
oodles of QST articles to prove it. Then they did an about face
because of the \$\$\$\$. ARRL does not represent a majority of hams anyway.
Gee let me think TAPR and AMSAT usually utilize frequencies above 50
MHZ. Of course they are gonna support something that increases their
membership whether or not it is good for the hobby. Increasing
membership is not necessarily a good thing in and of itself anyway.
Just listen to two meters and 70 cm. They are a disaster around here.
Jamming and intenonal interference have increased sharply aounrd here.

I supported a no-code "digital" license in the beginning. But now voice
and who knows what's next. My father has been licensed since 1957 and
he thinks the no-codes are a joke too. So don't think that because QCWA
supported it (probably with ARRL's prodding) that "most" hams in the
hobby for over 25 years agree with you. That is an invalid conclusion.

Sure incentive licensing makes sense. The idea was put forward to
increase the number of persons who had a special skill such as Morse
Code. Anyone can press a mic button and blab.

Even if code was dropped all together as an exam requirement (can't be
done because of international agreements) the exmas should at least be
made worthy of the knowledge an amateur radio operator is suppose to
posess.

```
-----  
- Christopher Ogren NM1Z          | The politically correct -  
- system@mooch.sbs.com           | term for no-codes is   -  
- AMPRnet: nm1z@switch.w1cg-9    | "Morsely Challenged". -  
- [44.104.0.2]                   |                          -  
- AX25net: NM1Z@KA1RCI.RI.USA.NA | MPD                     -  
-----
```

Date: Thu, 6 May 1993 20:02:15 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!mooch!news@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <718@zds-ux.UUCP>, <1993May04.020103.22057@anomaly.sbs.com>,
<1993May4.134040.25139@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>+
Subject : Re: no-code defense

tbodoh@resdgs1.er.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:

```
> I'm going to be a no-code Technician in about three weeks.  Would you prefer
> that all classes require code?  And then the brotherhood/sisterhood of
> ham radio operators resume it's slide into obscurity?  And then the unused
> frequencies are slowly reallocated to other services?  Don't flame me,
> this is exactly where ham radio WAS going before no-code.
```

Actually yes I would prefer that the hobby go that way. At least amateur radio operators wouldn't be known as a bunch of CB'ers who had to memorize the questions so they could talk to their "good buddies" across town on 2 meters. Spectrum might have been lost, but so what? If it is unused, nobody will miss it. What's the point of keeping it if it goes unused.

```
> Be careful who you call a scumbag. I am not just some ex-CBer - I've been
> involved in radio for 25+ years as a shortwave and scanner hobbyist. I'm
> also a Software Engineer. The future of ham radio must embrace computers
> in order to survive - or would you rather we go back to vacuum tubes? I
> may learn code eventually, but I think it should not be required until
> advanced and extra classes - and then only about 13 WPM - BUT that's my
> opinion and I won't call you a SCUMBAG for disagreeing. Although I suppose
> neanderthal may be closer ;)
```

What the hell do vacuum tubes have to do with code? It should have been made a "digital" license like it was supposed to be, but now we have moronic CB'ers all over 2 meters and 70 cm. I know I could ask most of the no-codes around here how to construct a dipole and all they would do is say, "go buy one, der". Granted there may be a few worthy individuals who are intelligent but largely around here they are idiots. They are a disgrace to the proud tradition of amateur radio. I'd rather lose it all then relinquish it to CB type operators. GAG!

It's a joke of a multiple guess exam anyway. Even the exam is given away. Why don't they just turn it into CB now and sell even more radios! Damn low rent, bottom feeding, simplistic scumbags! They deserve nothing!

```
- Christopher Ogren NM1Z | The politically correct -
- system@mooch.sbs.com | term for no-codes is -
- AMPRnet: nm1z@switch.w1cgr-9 | "Morsely Challenged". -
- [44.104.0.2] | -
```

- AX25net: NM1Z@KA1RCI.RI.USA.NA | MPD -

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #552
